



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/340,478 | 06/30/1999 | SANDEEP P. GOLIKERI | 2204/151 | 3956 |

7590

08/11/2004

Docket Clerk
P O Drawer 800889
Dallas, TX 75380

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

HARPER, KEVIN C

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2666

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/340,478

Applicant(s)

GOLIKERI ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin C. Harper

Art Unit

2666

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 9-15, 17-23, 25-31, 33, 34 and 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-8, 15, 24, 32 and 35 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed May 21, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that Alexander in view of Derby and Michels does not disclose exchanging address databases having locally owned addresses and remotely owned addresses. However, in Alexander, each switch (Figures 1 and 6, item 10) is connected to end devices (col. 3, lines 2-6). For a switch address database, the end devices connected to the switch represent locally owned addresses (col. 3, lines 7-23) and the end devices not connected to the switch represent remotely owned addresses (col. 6, line 65 through col. 7, line 4). Alexander in view of Derby suggests that because each switch periodically exchanges its own routing address database, the routing databases of each switch contains locally owned addresses and remotely owned addresses to facilitate inter-switch communication (Alexander, col. 10, lines 44-47; Derby Figure 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 3-4, 13-15, 17-19, 21-23, 25-27, 29-31, 33-34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander et al. (US 5,909,564) in view of Derby et al. (US 5,483,522) and Michels et al. (US 2003/00048864).

2. Regarding claims 1, 3-4, 13-15, 17-19, 21-23, 25-27, 29-31, 33-34 and 36, Alexander discloses a method for reporting information in a distributed communication system (Figure 2; col. 10, lines 37-40 and 44-48). Each address database includes locally owned address information and remotely owned information (col. 10, lines 44-50). The method comprises retrieving information from each distributed database (col. 10, lines 44-47) and reporting information (col. 10, lines 44-

Art Unit: 2666

47). However, Alexander does not explicitly disclose that address information is exchanged. Derby discloses several distributed nodes that periodically exchange locally owned and remotely owned address information in order to provide proper network routing for data packets (Figure 6; col. 5, lines 30-32, 56-62 and 64-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to exchange locally owned and remotely owned address information in the invention of Alexander. Further, Alexander in view of Derby does not disclose sorting the retrieved address information. Michels discloses sorting cached MAC addresses (Figure 4A, para. 40, lines 9-14) in order to more easily utilize the data (para. 33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to sort cached address information in the invention of Alexander in view of Derby. Further regarding claim 22-23, 26-27 and 33-34, the method operates on a computer readable medium (Alexander, col. 10, lines 57-61).

Claims 2 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander et al. in view of Derby et al. and Michels et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Daruwalla et al. (US 6,128,296).

3. Regarding claims 2 and 9, Alexander in view of Derby and Michels does not disclose including learned interface identifiers nor learned module identifiers in a locally owned address information. Daruwalla discloses including learned module identifiers and learned interface identifiers in locally owned address information (Figure 1; Figure 2, item 29; Figure 3, packet transaction no. 3; col. 4, lines 50-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include learned interface identifiers and learned module identifiers in locally owned address information in the invention of Alexander in view of Derby and Michels in order to properly route data packets to a proper destination within the network.

Art Unit: 2666

4. Regarding claim 10, Michels discloses that the sorting is performed by address-to-port mappings as noted in the rejection of claim 1 (Figure 4A).

Claims 11-12, 20 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander et al. in view of Derby et al. and Michels et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Akaboshi et al. (US 5,621,908).

5. Regarding claims 11-12, 20 and 28, Alexander in view of Derby and Michels does not disclose a parallel sort. Akaboshi discloses a parallel sort in order to perform a faster and more efficient sort (abstract; Figures 11-13 and 19-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have a parallel sort in the invention of Alexander in view of Derby and Michels.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 5-8, 16, 24, 32 and 35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the

Art Unit: 2666

date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Harper whose telephone number is 703-305-0139 (as of August 25, 2004, the number will be 571-272-3166). The examiner can normally be reached weekdays from 11:30 AM to 8:00 PM ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema S. Rao, can be reached at 703-308-5463 (as of August 25, 2004, the number will be 571-272-3174). The centralized fax number for the Patent Office is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only (applications must be associated with a customer number). For more information about the PAIR system, see pair.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kevin C. Harper



August 8, 2004

Seema S. Rao
SEEMA S. RAO 8/19/04
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600